



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/084,390	02/27/2002	Jeffrey M. Getchius	01-1005	6852
32127	7590	01/19/2005	EXAMINER	
VERIZON CORPORATE SERVICES GROUP INC. C/O CHRISTIAN R. ANDERSEN 600 HIDDEN RIDGE DRIVE MAILCODE HQEO3H14 IRVING, TX 75038			KINDRED, ALFORD W	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2163	

DATE MAILED: 01/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Applicati n No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/084,390	GETCHIUS, JEFFREY M.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Alford W. Kindred	2163	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 August 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Pri rity under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Detailed Action

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment filed on 08/19/04.

This action is made final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-5 and 8-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Srinivasan, US# 5,742,412.

As per claim 1, Srinivasan teaches “storing information associated with subscribers and usable to determine contexts associated with information requests” (see col. 3, lines 45-67) “storing contact information” (see col. 4, lines 1-26) “receiving an information request including identifying information associated with a requestor” (see col. 8, lines 42-65) “comparing the requester identifying information to determine whether the requester is one of the subscribers . . .” (see abstract) “determining a context for the information request when it is determined that the requester is one of the subscribers . . .” (see col. 3, lines 46-67 and col. 4, lines 1-26) “providing a response to the information request selected from the stored contact information based on a condition associated with the determined context for the request” (see col. 2, lines 1-38).

Art Unit: 2163

As per claim 2, Srinivasan teaches "determined using a caller ID lookup" (see col. 2, lines 15-34).

As per claim 3, Srinivasan teaches "a geographic location information" (see col. 5, lines 6-50).

As per claim 4, Srinivasan teaches "receiving signaling information from a voice network" (see col. 8, lines 1-40).

As per claim 5, Srinivasan teaches "determining whether a user is authorized to receive the response; and providing the response to the user based on a result of the determination" (see col. 8, lines 14-32).

As per claims 8-12, these claims are rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claims 1-5 and are similarly rejected.

As per claims 13-17, these claims are rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claims 1-5 and are similarly rejected.

As per claims 18-22, these claims are rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claims 1-5 and are similarly rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Srinivasan, in view of Crabtree et al., US# 2004/0044658 A1.

As per claims 6-7, these claims are rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claims 1-2 and are similarly rejected including the following:

Srinivasan teaches "obtaining information in the directory related to the destination to the user . . ." (see col. 7, lines 30-59) "determining a plurality of candidates satisfying the destination . . ." (see col. 5, lines 36-61). Srinivasan does not explicitly teach "wherein the context for the query request corresponds to the user." Crabtree et al. teaches "wherein the context for the query request corresponds to the user" (see paragraphs [0058]-[0059], and [0074]). It would have been obvious at the time of the invention for one of ordinary skill in the art to have combined the teachings of Srinivasan and Crabtree above, because using the steps of "wherein the context for the query request corresponds to the user", would have given those skilled in the art the tools to associate data according to a particular user's profile. This gives users the advantage of receiving data more closely related to the subject that they are requesting.

Response to Arguments

6. As per applicant's arguments regarding Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 6-7 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

7. Applicant's arguments filed 8/19/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

--As per applicant arguments that "Srinivasan does not disclose; storing information associated with subscribers and usable to determine contexts associated with an information request, determining a context for the information request . . . providing a response to the information request selected from the stored contact information based on a condition . . .", examiner maintains that Srinivasan's teachings of an element determining that callees subscribes for Internet identification, illustrates an information request determining a context for the information request in a manner similar to applicant's claim language. Both have a determining element, applicant's determining element includes a context whereas Srinivasan's teaches determining whether an internet identification is appropriate or not.

--As per applicant's arguments regarding "Srinivasan merely describes using a callee's user ID and password . . . Srinivasan does not then use information associated with a subscriber determine context associated with the information request based on a condition . . .", examiner maintains that Srinivasan teaches the determining whether callees subscribers include an Internet ID element combined with the storing of a caller ID, Internet ID and voice mail, teaches a context element associated with a condition as indicated in applicant claim language and therefore the rejection is maintained.

Conclusion

8. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alford W. Kindred whose telephone number is 571-272-4037. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 9:00 am- 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on (571) 272-4023. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2163

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Alford W. Kindred', is positioned above the printed name.

Alford W. Kindred
Patent Examiner
Tech Ctr. 2100